Eastern Illinois University
The Keep

Masters Theses | Student Theses & Publications

1997

Young Children's Talk at Play: Orientation to Self and Orientation to the Joint Exigencies of Conversation

Paige K. Parker
Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in Speech Communication at Eastern Illinois University. Find out more about the program.

Recommended Citation
Parker, Paige K., "Young Children's Talk at Play: Orientation to Self and Orientation to the Joint Exigencies of Conversation" (1997). *Masters Theses*. 1779.
https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/1779

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

7-31-97
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

_____

_____

_____

_____ _____

Author Date

Young Children's Talk at Play: Orientation to Self and Orientation to the Joint Exigencies of Conversation

(TITLE)

BY

Paige K. Parker

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1997
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

8-1-97
DATE

7/31/97
DATE

Running head: YOUNG CHILDREN'S TALK AT PLAY

Young Children's Talk at Play:
Orientation to Self and Orientation to the Joint Exigencies of Conversation

By

Paige K. Parker

B.A., Eastern Illinois University, 1996

M.A., Eastern Illinois University, 1997

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Speech Communication
in the Graduate School of
Eastern Illinois University, 1997

Charleston, Illinois

Abstract

This study employed a conversation analytic approach to determine how children in naturally constructed play episodes use language as an object of play and how children in their naturally occurring talk display orientation to their own individual activities and others' social actions. The participants were thirty-nine kindergarten and first grade students at South Elementary School in Marshall, Illinois. The study is based upon fifteen hours of conversation collected during recess periods. Relevant segments from the corpus were transcribed according to an adapted version of Jefferson's Transcript Notation System (1984). The findings suggested that (1) the groups of children used language as an object of play to make their play activities more enjoyable for themselves as well as others in naturally constructed settings; (2) it was not uncommon for the children to display in their talk orientation to their own individual line of activity; and (3) the children *did* orient to others' talk at times and employed specific communicative strategies to solicit their playmates' attention and involvement.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank the advisor of my thesis for her guidance and support. Dr. Shirley Staske is my mentor, my friend. I would also like to thank the other two members of my committee. Dr. Melanie Mills and Dr. Mark Borzi provided thoughtful, insightful comments and suggestions. Further, I would like to acknowledge the speech communication graduate faculty and students who contributed to my growth and development as a speech communication scholar.

This thesis would be non-existent if it were not for a select few individuals who were motivating, encouraging, loving, supportive and patient. My mom and dad and my boyfriend, Frank, were all of the above and more. I could not have completed this thesis without them.

Finally, I would like to thank the staff at South Elementary School and the children who participated in my study. The staff was supportive and interested, and the children always kept me smiling.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER		Page
I.	Introduction and Rationale	1
II.	A Review of the Literature	12
	Language as an Object of Play	12
	Role Taking vs. Egocentrism	15
	Communicative Processes, Functions, and Structures	19
	Conversation Analysis	21
III.	Research Questions and Methodoiogy	77
	Research Questions	24
	Data Collection Procedures	25
	Data Analysis	27
IV	Findings	28
	Language as an Object of Play	28
	Self Orientation	36
	Orientation to Others	39
	Appendix A	42
	Appendix B	43
	Appendix C	56
	References	57

CHAPTER I

Introduction/Rationale

Introduction

Imagine a group of five to seven year old children at play. "A focal point of the activity is talk" (Garvey, 1990; Goodwin, 1990, p. 12).

1. A: Magun.
2. M: What.
3. A: I'm the allagator
4. M: You're hopeless. You can neva get me no::w.
5. C: Look at me. Look at me.
6. M: Allagator. Ketch me. ((Scream)).
7. D: Allergator allergator can't ketch me. Who's the one that's upinthe tree. ((Scream)). ((Pause)). Allergators can't clime.
8. A: (An allagator coz I feel like climin). Rah:: Rah::
9. M/D: ((Scream)).
10. B: Allergator allergator allergator.
11. A: %RAH:: %RAH:: %RAH::
12. M/D: ((Scream)).

The aforementioned interaction is an example of children's talk at play. The children in my sample frequently created appropriate roles and contexts for play by engaging in fantasy play. Fantasy play involved "becoming" all types of creatures (people, animals, and objects). The young girl in this example *became* an alligator, creating the sound effect "Rah::." Consequently, her interactional partners assumed appropriate roles. They *became* terrified players in the activity. They ran away from the terrifying alligator, and they screamed in fright.

Children use language as an object of play in a variety of different ways. The child in the previous example used rhyme as an object of play in turn seven: "Allergator allergator can't ketch me. Who's the one that's upinthe tree."

Fantasy play involves a set of complex rules that evolve as the activity proceeds. Children must obey these rules or be sanctioned for their actions. M started to follow her fellow interactants up the jungle gym. In turn seven, D scolds, "Allergators can't clime." At that time, A had to descend from the jungle gym.

Play is easy to recognize, but difficult for some theorists to define. It is necessary to state as succinctly as possible what is meant by "play" because the term can be used to refer to a variety of different concepts. Garvey (1977) maintains that it is now generally agreed upon that play cannot be defined in terms of specific behaviors because almost any given behavior can be performed playfully or nonplayfully. Play is more usefully conceived as an orientation, a mode of experiencing, since a play orientation can be adopted toward anything the child does (Garvey, 1977). Play has intimate associations with systems of social meaning (Garvey, 1977, pp. 27-28). Garvey (1990, p. 4) further characterizes play:

> "Play is pleasurable, enjoyable. Even when not actually accompanied by signs of joy, it is still positively valued by the player. Play has no extrinsic goals. Its motivations are intrinsic and serve no other objectives. In fact, it is more of an enjoyment of means than an effort devoted to some particular end. In utilitarian terms, it is inherently unproductive. Play is spontaneous and voluntary. It is not obligatory but is freely chosen by the player. Play involves some active engagement on the part of the player. It requires engagement with aspects of the physical, conceptual or social world."

Rationale

Current research into children's talk during play suggests that children use language to make play more enjoyable for themselves and their playmates; they frequently manipulate language, using the words and sounds as objects of play (e.g., Garvey, 1990; Levy, 1986). Language provides resources for play at various levels of its structure and in its pragmatic or functional aspects (Garvey, 1977). Language acquisition scholars have very little information on spontaneous play with language (Garvey, 1990). Consequently, more studies on spontaneous play with language are in demand.

Garvey's study (1977) explored children's use of language as an object of play. Her subjects were forty-eight dyads of same and mixed sex preschool children. The children were previously acquainted with one another. They were placed in a laboratory setting and observed for fifteen to twenty minutes. While Garvey's work provides some important, valuable contributions, the current study is still needed. The current study investigated children's use of language as an object of play as well. The subjects, however, were thirty-nine *school-aged* children of same- and mixed-sex *groups*. The previously acquainted children were observed at play in *naturally constructed* settings for *twenty to thirty minutes*. The current study was essential because we still do not know how children use language as an object of play in their own, naturally constructed play episodes with multiple peers, and theorists argue that play talk is vitally important to the social and cognitive development of young children.

Some adults consider play to be trivial, nonessential and inherently unproductive (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987). However, play theorists and child development scholars now consider play a core educational activity since it is being recognized as a primary source of cognitive and social development in young children (e.g., Frost, & Sunderlin, 1985; Garza, Briley, & Reifel, 1985; Saracho, 1986). Frost and Sunderlin (1985, p. 17) contend that "Piaget discusses play as assimilation, the driving force behind learning; Vygotsky theorizes that play is foundational to later abstract thought." Fein (1985) maintains that studies have shown that there are multiple benefits derived from

children's play such as: (1) enhanced creativity, (2) perspective-taking, language and memory and (3) problem solving. These results are significant because they confirm the fact that play is a valuable childhood experience.

According to Johnson, Christie, and Yawkey (1987, p. 1), research has shown that fantasy play (two or more children adopting roles and acting out a make-believe situation or story) has had a significantly positive effect on the cognitive and social development of children.

> "Fantasy play training can result in increased language development. There is a positive relationship between fantasy play and reading, writing, and story comprehension. There are positive correlations between fantasy play and several measures of social competence. Training in fantasy play has been shown to result in social skills such as cooperation. Children who frequently engage in fantasy play were rated as more popular by teachers and peers. Play promotes cooperation and creativity through which children actively construct their social worlds." (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987, p. 17).

Research indicates that fantasy play has the capability of enhancing children's role-taking skills as well as their interpersonal skills. Johnson, Christie, and Yawkey (1987) argue that the children in fantasy play have to use social skills such as cooperation and turn-taking in order to keep the play episode going. Thus, group dramatic play provides an opportunity for children to practice and perfect their social skills. Children follow conversational rules and use language precisely to plan story lines and to designate the make-believe identities of objects and actions (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987). When children follow conversational rules and use language as described, they orient to their playmates' social actions and together construct their play episodes.

The imaginative use of language is important in social play as well as in common, ordinary, everyday interaction. Play teaches serious lessons for life. Role play is practice

in the production of social reality (Corsaro, 1985). Role play activities are frequently a reflection of the desires of the children "to play at reality" or to "experiment" with developing social knowledge (Corsaro, 1985, p. 77). "Children are negotiating real-life social encounters through fantasy play" (Haslett, 1983, p. 126). "Both contexts require the children to interpret the communicative constraints of that context, establish roles, "act out" the roles, and confirm their understanding through verbal and nonverbal interaction" (Haslett, 1983, p. 126). According to Haslett (1983), play then becomes "practice" for real-life social encounters, but without the sanctions of those real-life encounters. This is a valuable childhood experience.

"Fantasies generate play during which the skills of interpersonal behavior (e.g., cooperation, trust, gratitude, coping with anxiety) are sharpened" (Musolf, 1996, p. 308). Spontaneous fantasy stimulates training in strategies for coping with the uncertainties, dilemmas, quandaries and exigencies of everyday life with responses such as contingencies, plans of action, novelty, cooperation and leadership (Musolf, 1996, p. 308). Children acquire these interactional skills through "communicative strategies" or "discourse abilities," such as turn-taking and topic selection, thereby establishing group cohesion (Musolf, 1996). Thus, according to Musolf (1996, p. 308), "children's construction of social worlds through spontaneous fantasy play underscores how children, through language, play an active role in their own socialization; and, dialectically, by participating in spontaneous fantasy, children develop language skills."

Play also facilitates the development of oral language abilities in young children. Consequently, it is useful to explore the links between language and play to determine if play is a useful vehicle for developing the communicative competence of children. According to Levy (1986), little research has been done on language as an object of play, even though theory suggests that it makes vital contributions to a child's language learning. "If meta-linguistic awareness (the ability to make language forms opaque and to attend to them in and for themselves) is as necessary for beginning reading as present

thinking suggests, then more study of play with language may unlock better ways to facilitate beginning literacy" (Levy, 1986, p. 171).

"The language that children use *with other children* has rarely been systematically investigated" (Goodwin, 1990, p. 12). Goodwin (1990) maintains that when the language and interaction of children above the age of four have been studied, research has typically been conducted in the classroom environment. Studies of language acquisition generally only deal with children below the age of four and tend to focus on the relationship between the child and the caretaker rather than among peers (Goodwin, 1990). One of the primary foci of the current study is the way in which children, in their naturally occurring talk, differentially displayed orientation to their own individual line of action and to their peers' social actions in the context of play-time episodes.

M. H. Goodwin's study (1990) provides vitally important contributions to the speech communication discipline, and the methodology employed in this study follows from her work. This study differs from Goodwin's (1990) in that the children she investigated were considerably older than the children under investigation in this study. The children in the current study were between the ages of five and seven. An examination of children in this age group is essential because they are in the process of moving toward a greater and greater ability to take the perspective of others rather than relying so heavily on the egocentric point of view (Denzin, 1979). We have yet to determine how children display, in their talk, orientation to their own individual line of activity (reflecting an egocentric point of view) and orientation to the social activities of others (reflecting some concern for the joint demands of social interaction).

According to Markey, it would be naive to assume that the emergence of self arises only with the child's use of the first person pronoun (Denzin, 1979). "We have yet to fully understand how "the other" enters into the organization and genesis of self in early childhood" (Denzin, 1979, p. 551). According to Denzin (1979), social psychologists have barely touched the surface of these issues. Given the influence of Mead's broad

outline of stages in the development of self, it is surprising that there has been so little research on children's development of social knowledge (Corsaro, 1985, p. 76). The study of childhood is strongly urged. Naturalistic studies of child and peer interaction are necessary for an understanding of how children acquire social knowledge and the interactive and conversational skills required to link such knowledge with ongoing interactive events (Corsaro, 1985, p. 76). According to Corsaro (1985, pp. 76-77) naturalistic studies of children's spontaneous role play are crucial for the discovery of how children acquire social knowledge. The current study was a close-up, naturalistic, ethnographic, study of kindergarten and first grade children during ordinary play activities.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Chapter one demonstrates that close-up, naturalistic, ethnographic studies of children's play are necessary because little research has been conducted on the language that children use with other children, language as an object of play, and children's development of social knowledge. This study focuses on children's use of language as an object of play and children's orientation to their own individual activities as well as others' lines of action. This study is of the utmost importance because play has been recognized as a primary source of cognitive and social development in young children. It develops children's oral language abilities, and it enhances role-taking and interpersonal skills. Children are also able to negotiate real-life social encounters through fantasy play.

Language as an Object of Play

Children use language as an object or resource for play. "There are five types of spontaneous social play with language: play with noises and sounds; play with the linguistic system; spontaneous rhyming and word play; play with speech acts and discourse conventions; and play with fantasy and nonsense" (Garvey, 1990, p. 67). There can be more than one type of social play with language in a single interaction, but it seems the distinctions have to do with different uses of language resources for play (Garvey, 1990). Language play indicates that the child actually knows the correct meaning and usage of the word distorted in play (Levy, 1986). Levy (1986, p. 171) reports that "language as an object of play has been identified as meta-linguistic awareness."

Play with Noises and Sounds and Play with the Linguistic System. It has been argued that the most primitive level of verbal play is play with noises and sounds (Garvey, 1990). Making noises, according to Garvey (1990), can be enjoyed as absorbing in itself or can be used to provide special sound effects. Conventionalized noises are used to identify specific events and actions (Garvey, 1977). Garvey (1977, p. 31) maintains that "these noises, each of which has a specialized meaning, appear to be an almost essential

part of the particular event or action for the child who performs the action." However, insofar as they are conventional, the noises can also serve to identify the meaning of what is happening for a playmate. "Some of these noises are built from sound units (phonemes) of the child's language, but others represent noises that do not occur in the formation of English words" (Garvey, 1977, p. 31). Garvey (1977) offers examples of such action-identifying tags used by American children: boom-boom (the explosion of a gun) and vroom vroom (the racing engine).

Research reveals that young children often play with the different forms and rules of language. "They play with sounds by repeating strings of nonsense syllables, with syntax by systematically replacing words of the same grammatical category, and with semantics by intentionally distorting meaning through nonsense and jokes" (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987, p. 17). This type of language play, according to Johnson, Christie, and Yawkey (1987), allows children to perfect their newly acquired language skills and increases their conscious awareness of linguistic rules.

Spontaneous Rhyming and Word Play. The most obvious type of word play is rhyme. Rhymes are frequently constructed by children as an object or resource of play. "In all types of playful vocalizations, the meaning of the words is secondary or nonexistent and it is the sound and rhythm alone that is enjoyed or that enhances the accompanying activity" (Garvey, 1977, p. 31).

Play with Speech Acts and Discourse Conventions. Society depends on the conversational rule "say what you believe to be true" (Garvey, 1990, p. 72). If this social rule is well understood, according to Garvey (1990), play with false assertions is possible.

Play with Fantasy and Nonsense. Fantasy play occurs when two or more children adopt roles and act out a make-believe situation or story (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987, p. 1). It involves "becoming" all types of creatures (people, animals, and objects) and the creation of social worlds "through [the child's] manipulation and animation of various objects and materials" (Musolf, 1996, p. 307).

The imaginative use of language appeared necessary to construct play settings and roles that could be mutually acted upon by participants in a study conducted by Haslett (1983). Children used verbal means to explore their physical environment and manipulate their social environment through coordinated, cooperative, socially negotiated play (Haslett, 1983). Garvey (1990) found that the social play of make-believe relied primarily on communication, and that verbal enactment of pretend identities was a major communicative strategy. Haslett (1983) confirmed the importance of make-believe and the importance of language in establishing and maintaining play.

Children gain valuable language practice by engaging in fantasy play. Play with fantasy and nonsense adds the dimension of meaning distortion as a resource for play. Chukovsky wrote, "Hardly has the child comprehended with certainty which objects go together and which do not, when he begins to listen happily to verses of absurdity" (Garvey, 1990, p. 70). As soon as a child learns how something is supposed to be, it becomes a source of play to distort or exaggerate it in some way. Garvey (1990) reports that children create meaningless common nouns that are odd for entertainment.

The assignment of funny names to self, to partner, or to imaginary others reflects awareness of the significance of the normal name and address system (Garvey, 1990). Children insist that they be called by their given names in non-play interactions.

Children follow conversational rules and use language precisely to plan story lines and to designate the make-believe identities of objects and actions (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987). All social play is governed by rules. Children must be able to understand the rules of play. Rules are very complex in fantasy play. Once a child adopts a role, he or she must be consistent within that role or be sanctioned. Rules for fantasy play are not set in advance. The rules are established by the players during the course of the play. This conscious manipulation of the rules provides children with the opportunity to examine the nature of rules and rule making (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987).

Therefore, play is a context in which children learn about certain rules such as turn-taking as well as the meaning of rules in general.

Role Taking vs. Egocentrism

Role Taking. Make-believe play becomes a critical way in which children learn to make sense of their world (Singer, 1995). The role playing that occurs in fantasy play contributes to another important aspect of social development: the ability to view the world from the perspective of another person (Johnson, Christie, and Yawkey, 1987). Role-taking, role playing and playing-at-a-role represent the child's imagined construction of another's line of action (Denzin, 1972). When children engage in fantasy play, they act out numerous roles such as parent, child and superhero. Children psychologically place themselves in other people's places and experience the world from their points of view. Research indicates that dramatic play training enhances children's perspective-taking skills and, thus, their interpersonal skills.

Imaginative play may provide children with the opportunity to identify possible selves (Singer, 1995). Singer (1995) argues that children who do not engage in make-believe play on a regular basis are significantly disadvantaged by the limited opportunities to try out possible selves (take the roles of others). Imaginative play allows children to act out and confirm the social roles they are assuming in their play (Haslett, 1983). Taking the role of others in play enables the child to reflect back upon his or her own actions from the viewpoint of others (Corsaro, 1986, p. 77). "Play and games contribute fundamentally to the emergence of self and mind by cultivating the ability to take the roles of others" (Musolf, 1996, p. 306). They function as "forms of anticipatory socialization, through which children learn to interact with each other" (Musolf, 1996, pp. 307-308).

"The fact that the child does interchange stimuli and takes the role of the other person has been emphasized especially by Mead and by Cooley specifically" (Denzin, 1979, p. 551). Mead's theory stressed that the self develops through the social and

cognitive processes of role taking and language acquisition (Musolf, 1996). Role-taking, or taking the attitude of another, is the process by which children are socialized and develop selves. According to Musolf (1996, p. 305), "the mechanism of role-taking is language and, dialectically, language acquisition is a product of socialization through imitation at first, and then taking the role of the other." "Role-taking and language acquisition are inseparable, unquantifiable and unprioritizable processes of self-objectification and self-development" (Musolf, 1996, p. 305).

Egocentrism. Research suggests that young children experience great difficulty with role-taking. This difficulty is attributed to the egocentric, self-centeredness of their thought (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987). There is no difference between the self and the non-self for young children. Thus, they assume that their point of view is the *only* point of view. As children become more aware of others' views, and they attempt to accommodate these views, they are constrained by their own egocentrism (Haslett, 1983). However, the self, according to Johnson, Christie, and Yawkey (1987, p. 101), eventually "decenters" and becomes separated from the environment as children mature. The process of decentration makes it possible for children to recognize that other people can have thoughts, feelings, and perceptions of their own (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987). Johnson, Christie, and Yawkey (1987) maintain that the act of children transforming their own identities into make-believe identities may speed up the "decentration" process, promoting role taking and other cognitive skills.

The child's sense of self is central to the integration of the symbolic process. Markey observes:

> "It is not so much due to the fact that the child is ego-centric or "believes" himself to be the center of the universe as that he actually is the center of his "known" universe. His own behavior becomes a center of symbolization and knowledge for him" (Denzin, 1979, p. 554).

In this quotation, Markey criticizes Piaget who had argued that the child, until the age of seven, was egocentric and unable to take the attitude of others. Although children's verbal interactions are assumed to be limited as a result of their egocentrism, several studies have found that children adjust messages to their listeners' needs (Haslett, 1983). In fact, this acting out possible selves creates a working consensus that organizes the imagined or make-believe identity (Haslett, 1983). According to Haslett (1983, p. 125), "this reflects the child's decreasing egocentricity and increasing use of adaptive communicative strategies, which allow the child to verbally manipulate the environment to create appropriate roles and contexts for mutual play." Markey suggests that Piaget should have made his observations under more normal circumstances. Like Markey, Mead believed that the child's reflexive ability varies according to the play situation for, as the child develops, he or she relinquishes his or her egocentric view of self, rules and the world around him or her (Denzin, 1972).

Self Concept. Kinch (1967, p. 232) defines self concept as "the organization of qualities that the individual attributes to him or herself." The general theory behind the self concept is the individual's conception of him or herself which emerges from social interaction and, in turn, guides or influences the behavior of that individual (Kinch, 1967). The development of self concept can be attributed to a group of social scientists who have coined themselves symbolic interactionists (Trenholm & Jensen, 1992).

The Self. Mead viewed the human being as an organism having a self (Blumer, 1969). In asserting that the human being has a self, he simply meant that the human being is an object to him or herself. Thus, the human being may become an object of his or her own action. For Mead and Cooley, the self develops as the child acquires the ability to take on the attitudes of others: the child must separate self from other and take the attitude of the other (Denzin, 1972). According to Denzin (1972), the self is a social process, a product of symbolic interaction, that is observable in the interaction process.

The self is "...created, established, and presented in the communication process" (Blumer, 1969, p. 295).

Mead (1962) also maintained that the language process was central to the development of the self. The self develops out of the universes of discourse and experience which are routinely confronted by the young child (Denzin, 1972). "With names and labels (language) we are able to step outside our selves as subjects and see our selves as others do (reflexive role taking)--that is, as objects" (Musolf, 1996, p. 305). We become conscious of our selves (reflective self consciousness) and separate our selves from others (Musolf, 1996), ceasing to think in animalistic, finalistic, and narrow moral terms (Denzin, 1972). We also behave toward our selves as objects: planning, initiating, controlling and refraining from action (Musolf, 1996). According to Musolf (1996), other objects, and ourselves as subjects, are not entities but symbols. Through the social conventions of language, we do not passively receive or directly "see" objects, but actively constitute them as objects-as-they-appear-to-us (Musolf, 1996). Interacting with other objects and our selves as objects, as symbolic representations, we engage in symbolic interaction (Musolf, 1996).

Extending and elaborating Mead, Markey observes that the human hand and the human capacity to see and hear itself act are critical to the emergence of self in the symbolic process (Denzin, 1979, p. 550). The meaning of objects, according to Markey, is to be found in behavior, including speech activity (Denzin, 1979).

"I and Me" or Subjective and Objective Self. Symbolic interactionists use the term self in two very different ways. The self refers to a process of alternating between two states of consciousness that Mead referred to as "I" and "me." First, a person in the "I" state of consciousness is a "subject" acting toward other people or events in an immediate, spontaneous, and impulsive way (Trenholm & Jensen, 1992, p. 119). Second, a person in the "me" state of consciousness perceives him or herself as an "object" and imagines how others might see that same object (Trenholm & Jensen, 1992).

The self as an object to itself is represented in the word "self," which is a reflexive, and indicates that which can both be subject and object (Mead, 1962, p. 135). Staske (1996) argues that the human's ability to see self as an object provides continuous interaction between the self as subject/knower and the self as object/known. She further states that an individual's subjective experience both informs and is informed by the experience created as one takes on the role of the other and views the self from that perspective.

To have a self, the child (1) must view him/herself as a distinct object and realize that his/her self is not the same as the material-body self and (2) he/she must be able to distinguish him/herself as both object and subject (Denzin, 1972, p. 306). In other words, he or she must be able to distinguish him or herself from other objects. The genesis of self, according to Denzin (1972), involves a simultaneous awareness of self and other.

Communicative Processes, Functions and/or Structures

Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1978). Conversation is characterized by turn taking. "One participant A, talks, stops; another B starts, talks, stops; and so obtain A-B-A-B-A-B distribution of talk across two participants" (Levinson, 1983, p. 296). Less than five percent of the speech stream in adult conversation is delivered in overlap (two speakers speaking simultaneously), yet gaps between one person speaking and another starting are often measurable in just a few microseconds (Levinson, 1983, p. 296). Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1978) suggest that the mechanism that governs turn-taking, and accounts for the properties as mentioned, is a set of rules with ordered options that operate on a turn-by-turn basis and can thus be termed a local management system.

According to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1978), the allocation of turns is not a matter of simply waiting for a silence but a complex social organization of rights and responsibilities. There seems to be a rule that when two speakers overlap, there is a need for some kind of "repair." Speakers display an orientation and sensitivity to those

participating in the conversation. Listeners can identify relevant transition points and either self-select or abide by the speaker's nomination of next speaker (Sacks et al., 1978). Turns must correspond to surrounding turns. Listeners collaborate via backchannel cues (e.g., nodding, smiling, interrupting) while the speaker adapts his turn to the audience. In general, turn-taking in conversation is organized by a set of rules with ordered options which function on a turn-by-turn basis.

Sacks et al. (1978) contend that the turn-taking system directly affects such vital factors as sticking to the topic under discussion, accomplishing the purpose of the talk exchange, and reflecting a mutual frame of reference. First the system provides an intrinsic motivation to listen; a speaker willing to speak next must monitor the conversation carefully. Second, members must attend the conversation in order to know what is being done with the talk. And third, the listener must display his or her understanding of prior turns.

The unit of the turn changes quite a bit with development. Preschoolers seem to negotiate turns well among peers, but, as the work on egocentrism corroborates, they do not fully integrate their contributions with ongoing topics and activities (Dore, 1985, p. 50). Children learn to abide by stricter institutional constraints as to when and how to talk in school (Dore, 1985).

Adjacency Pairs. Adjacency pairs are a local organizational structure in conversation (Levinson, 1983). Levinson (1983) maintains that adjacency pairs are the type of paired utterances of which question-answer, summons-response, offer-acceptance, greeting-greeting, etc. are protypical. Schegloff and Sacks characterize adjacency pairs as: "(1) adjacent (2) produced by different speakers (3) ordered as a first part and a second part (4) typed, so that a particular first part required a particular second part (or range of second parts)--e.g. offers a response to a summons, greetings require greetings, questions require answers etc...and there is a rule governing adjacency pairs, namely: Having produced a first part of some pair, current speaker must stop speaking, and next

speaker must produce at that point a second part to the same pair" (Levinson, 1983, pp. 303-304).

Thus, adjacency pairs are a sequence of two utterances produced by different speakers ordered as a first pair part (FPP) and a second pair part (SPP). The FPP constitutes some action the speaker is performing and the SPP is a response to that action. These are deeply embedded in the turn-taking system as techniques for choosing next speaker (Levinson, 1983).

Adjacency pairs appear to be an important element of conversational organization. Levinson (1983) suggests that the aforementioned characterization is only an approximation, and it is inadequate in some very important respects.

Conversation Analysis

One approach to the study of social order that stresses the analysis of talk itself as a body of social practices can be discovered in the qualitative method of conversation analysis and in the ethnomethodological tradition that it came from (Goodwin, 1990). There is a particularly nice fit between qualitative methods and the manifest properties of discourse organization (Jacobs, 1990). The term "ethnomethodology" is used to refer to the investigation of the rational properties of indexical expressions and other practical actions such as children's play as contingent ongoing accomplishments of organized artful practices of everyday life (Garfinkel, 1967, p. 11). Conversation analysis is an empirical approach which avoids premature theory construction and can provide empirical evidence for claims (e.g., Jacobs, 1990; Levinson, 1983). According to Capella (1990) and Levinson (1983), the search is made for recurring patterns across many records of naturally occurring conversations. Recurring patterns in conversation allow analysts to make claims about structure (Jacobs, 1990).

Conversation analysts seek to describe the processes used by participants in conversation so that they may better understand their behavior. In other words, the question is not *why* some specific action is acted out but *how* conversational events are

achieved as the systematic products of orderly procedures (Goodwin, 1990). Conversation analysts try to explicate the procedures participants use to construct and make intelligible their talk and the events that happen within it (Goodwin, 1990). For conversation analysts, structure and order in conversational discourse consist in *sense* and *meaningfulness* (Jacobs, 1990). Conversation analysis explores the systematic organization of human interaction. That which is being investigated is the units embedded within the interaction.

The goal of ethnomethodology/conversation analysis is to explicate the methods that members of a culture use in accomplishing everyday activities (Pomerantz, 1990). Similarly, Heritage and Atkinson (1984, p. 1) maintain that "the central goal of conversation analytic research is the description and explication of the competencies that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participating in intelligible, socially organized interaction. At its most basic, this objective is one of describing the procedures by which conversationalists produce their own behavior and understand and deal with the behavior of others."

Pomerantz (1990, p. 231) contends that conversation analytic researchers routinely make at least three claims: (1) the interactants are "doing" particular social action, identities, and roles; (2) we offer analyses of methods that interactants use in accomplishing particular actions, roles, or identities; (3) we propose how methods work (their sequential features and interactional consequences). The first type of claim is a *characterization of the action,* the second type is a *proposed method,* and the third type is its *proposed features* (Pomerantz, 1990, p. 231-232).

In developing analyses, conversation analysts examine instances of interaction to make proposals about methods of accomplishing action and features of interaction (Pomerantz, 1990). Likewise, we use instances of interaction to illustrate assertions and demonstrate claims. "We place the greatest confidence in claims when we trust that transcripts are drawn from a broad, extensive recording of talk; that the analyst has

impartially collected all relevant cases; that the contrasts are clear-cut enough that formal tabulation is superfluous" (Jacobs, 1990, p. 247).

Most of the advances in conversation analysis are the result of observational techniques made possible by the development of audio- and video-tape recording (Jacobs, 1990). Jacobs (1990, p. 248) maintains that "this technology has undoubtedly reduced the threat of selective bias beyond what could be expected with traditional naturalistic observation of

ongoing talk or the hypothetical method of linguists." As Jacobs (1990, p. 248) says, "conversation analysts need not overhear talk and then run to the bathroom to jot down notes on toilet paper. Taping is an impartial process. And, together with transcripts, tapes can be listened to repeatedly and carefully inspected for detail."

With the exception of Goodwin (1990), few studies have used a conversation analytic approach to discover the nuances of children's play-time talk. It is for this reason that children's play with their peers needs to be systematically investigated via conversation analysis.

CHAPTER III

Research Questions and Methodology

The preceding two chapters of this thesis demonstrate that little is known about the language that children use *with other children* and whether the child is focused on his or her own line of activity or the actions of others. Studies of language acquisition generally only deal with children below the age of four and tend to focus on the relationship between the child and the caretaker rather than among peers. The present study focused on the peer relationships of children between the ages of 5.8 and 7.10.

In the previous chapter, it was determined that researchers have conflicting opinions concerning the age in which the child is able to take the attitude of others. Because of such conflict, it is necessary to examine school-age children that are in the process of moving toward a greater and greater ability to take the perspective of others rather than relying so heavily on the egocentric point of view. Consequently, this specific population was chosen. The children in my sample were prime candidates for the current study. A close-up, naturalistic, ethnographic study of children's play-time talk will give readers an idea of whether children at this age are primarily focused on their own line of action or the activities of others.

This chapter of the thesis outlines the research questions and explains the methodology utilized in the study. It begins with the research questions the study is designed to answer and is followed by data collection procedures. The qualitative method utilized in data analysis is then described.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: How do children in naturally constructed play episodes use language as an object of play?

Research Question 2: In the context of play-time activities, how do children in their naturally occurring talk display orientation to their individual activities?

Research Question 3: In the context of play-time activities, how do children in their naturally occurring talk display orientation to others' social actions?

Data Collection Procedures

Subjects. The subjects were nineteen kindergarten students and twenty first grade students at South Elementary School in Marshall, Illinois. There were ten boys and nine girls in the kindergarten class, and there were twelve boys and nine girls in the first grade class. The ages in the kindergarten class ranged from 5.8 to 6.10. The ages in the first grade class ranged from 6.8 to 7.10. These participants were observed at play for approximately eight weeks. The children played in groups of four to six at recess. Some of the groups were same-sex, others were mixed-sex.

Procedures. The following study replicates the method used by Goodwin (1990) in her research conducted on the Maple Street Kids. It seeks to treat children's practical play activities as topics of empirical study. I selected a site where I could observe repetitive sequences of children's talk without becoming a major participant in that talk because I wanted to observe how children coordinate and construct interaction at play. The kindergarten and first grade classes at South Elementary School in Marshall, Illinois provided that possibility. Children in the kindergarten and first grade classes at South Elementary School played together in peer groups with minimal adult interference during recess. The children were more concerned with their interactions with one another than their interactions with an adult conversation analyst. Consequently, they could be observed unobtrusively as they went about their play. This was a good setting for exploring the elaboration of social processes among children.

Notes were sent home to the parents of the participants of this study informing them that I was interested in observing their children for a few months because I was conducting a study on the everyday play activities of children. Permission was granted by

all parents (see Appendix A). I was specifically interested in the play activities carried out through talk when I began my fieldwork with the children.

After observing the children for a few weeks, I realized that the primary activity of their play was talk. The most accurate and detailed records I had of the children's talk were audio tapes. Obviously, one of the weaknesses of audio tapes is that they do not provide a visual record of what the children are doing. The information provided by the audio tapes, however, allowed me to closely monitor the children's interactions without the distraction of a video camera. In fact, the audio recorder became a part of the environment in which the peer groups were playing. After a few days, the children did not appear to take notice of the audio recorder.

There were several advantages of this project. I was once a student at South Elementary School so I was known by everyone. My presence during the children's play activities and my purpose in recording them were neither considered objectionable by their parents nor the staff at South Elementary School. Adult intervention in the children's play activities was rare.

My actual method of research consisted of placing a tape recorder next to the peer group of children at play. I sat off to the side of the peer group observing so as to be as unobtrusive as possible. I recorded for approximately two months. The children knew they were being recorded, but talked directly to the machine only in the first few days of recording. The recorder became a natural part of the peer group environment. In my fieldwork, I attempted to record whatever the talk the children produced without consideration of how mundane or uninteresting the talk may have originally seemed.

I tried to minimize my interaction with the children while I was observing them so I would disturb their play activities as little as possible. My role was different in this respect from that of other ethnographers of children in that I was more of an observer of their play activities than a participant observer. The phenomena examined in my

fieldwork, children's use of talk during play with their peers, would have been particularly sensitive to intrusion on my part. As research in conversation analysis has demonstrated, talk, rather than being performed by an abstract, isolated speaker, emerges within particular speaker/hearer relationships and indeed can be modified by interaction between speaker and recipient even as the talk is emerging (Goodwin, 1990, p. 23).

Data Analysis

Transcription. Fifteen hours of children's conversation were reviewed multiple times, and segments of the children's talk which were relevant to the research questions addressed by this study were identified. Texts of actual instances of the phenomenon discussed are provided so that others might inspect the records which form the basis for my analysis (see Appendix B). Segments were then transcribed according to a notation system adapted from Jefferson's Transcript Notation System (Jefferson, 1984; see Appendix C). "This system is designed to provide an extremely detailed description of the talk as it is uttered and marks overlaps (simultaneous talk by both speakers) and various nonverbal, paralinguistic cues such as changes in volume, pitch, stress, and rate, sound extensions, pauses, and various other speech sounds, e.g., laughter, groans, coughs, sniffles, inhalation, exhalation, etc." (Staske, 1994, p. 86). Furthermore, according to Staske (1994, pp. 86-87), "utterances are transcribed as they are said (rather than as they would be written) up to the point of unrecognizability", i.e., "Wherdja git that truck?" rather than "Where did you get that truck?"

Analysis. The local organizational structures being employed by the children to display orientation to self and others and to identify language as an object of play were examined. The transcripts and tapes were then reviewed multiple times.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

Language as an Object of Play

Garvey (1990, 1977) conducted a study to determine how young children used language as an object of play. Her subjects were forty-eight dyads of same- and cross-sex children drawn from five private nursery schools. Each dyad was observed for approximately fifteen minutes. The previously acquainted children were observed in a laboratory setting. Garvey (1990, 1977) found that children utilized five types of spontaneous social play with language: play with noises and sounds; play with the linguistic system; spontaneous rhyming and word play; play with speech acts and discourse conventions; and play with fantasy and nonsense (Garvey, 1990, p. 67).

One of the primary foci of the current study, and the first research question addressed by it, concerned how children in *naturally constructed* (as opposed to *laboratory constructed)* play activities use language as an object of play. It was determined that the groups of kindergarten and first grade children in the present study used language as an object of play in much the same way as Garvey's nursery school dyads.

Play with Noises and Sounds and Play with the Linguistic System. It has been argued that the most primitive level of verbal play is play with noises and sounds (Garvey, 1990). Making noises, according to Garvey (1990), can be used to provide special sound effects. For example, the children in my sample created the acceleration of their toy cars with the sound effect "vroo::m," explosions with the sound effect "psshh::," and gunfire with the sound effect "boom-boom." Other children were mimicking the sounds that farm animals make. For example, the children in my sample were chickens "bock bo::ck b-b-bbo::ck," horses "whee:: hee:: hee::," pigs "oink oink oink oink oink oink oink," lions "roar::" and dragons "rarr::."

Research reveals that young children often play with the different forms and rules of language. They play with sounds by repeating strings of nonsense syllables, with syntax by systematically replacing words of the same grammatical category, and with semantics by intentionally distorting meaning through nonsense and jokes (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987, p. 17). One of my participants initiated the chant "chicka chicka bang bang" in a loose singsong rhythm. Her conversational partner joined in the chant and repeated it several times.

Interaction #7 Tape 1 Side A: 1425

1. A: <Chicka chicka bang bang.>
2. B: <Chicka chicka bang bang.> <Chicka chicka bang bang.> <Chicka chicka bang bang.>

Another child and her conversational partner were amused by play with semantics, intentionally distorting meaning through nonsense and jokes.

Interaction #12 Tape 4 Side A: 69

1. A: This is a horsepiddle.
2. B: A horsepiddle?
3. A: Yeah (.) This is a horsepiddle.
4. B: Where do you put the horses (dingy).

I I

5. A: I said the horsepiddle. ((both laugh)).

This type of language play, according to Johnson, Christie, and Yawkey (1987), allows children to perfect their newly acquired language skills and increases their conscious awareness of linguistic rules.

Spontaneous Rhyming and Word Play. The most obvious type of word play is rhyme (Garvey, 1990). Two simple rhymes were constructed by my sample of children. One child was responsible for rhyming me with tree (turn seven).

Interaction #3 Tape 1 Side A: 142

1. A: Magun.
2. M: What.
3. A: I'm the allagator.
4. M: You're hopeless. You can neva get me no::w.
5. C. Look at me. Look at me.
6. M: Allagator. Ketch me ((Scream)).
7. D: Allergator allergator can't ketch me. Who's the one that's up in the tree ((scream)). Allergators can't clime.
8. A: (An allagator coz I feel like climin). Rah:: Rah::
9. M/D: ((Scream)).
10. B: Allergator allergator allergator.
11. A: %RAH:: %RAH:: %RAH::
12. M/D: ((Scream)).

Another group of children was absorbed in the task of putting a puzzle together. In turn one, one child asks the question, "Where's the dinky dinky piece." The other children generate various rhymes for the word "dinky" in turns three to fourteen.

Interaction #6 Tape 1 Side A: 1305

1. A: Where's the dinky dinky piece.
2. M: (Sam (.) Don't even think about playin ((laugh))).
3. C: Dinky. Pinky. ((laugh)).
4. J: Clinky.
5. E: Dinky.
6. J: Winky.
7. M: That goes at the bottom.
8. J: Dinky.
9. M: Hey wait a minute.
10. E: %Drinky. %Pinky.

11. J: Tink. Rinky.

12. E: Nikki.

13. J: Rinky. Clinky.

14. C: Crinky. Rinky.

I I

15. A: Ju:stin be qui:et.

16. M: You guys we gotta figure this out.

Play with Speech Acts and Discourse Conventions. Society depends on the conversational rule "say what you believe to be true" (Garvey, 1990, p. 72). If this social rule is well understood, according to Garvey (1990), play with false assertions is plausible. The participants in my study broke this rule with the intention of creating a joke in interaction three. For example, in the segment illustrated above, one child says to the other, "I'm the allagator." Her conversational partner responds by saying, "You're hopeless you can neva get me no::w" (see Appendix B). Asserting what is not true can serve as a basis for social play only if both partners are aware that the interaction is playful (Garvey, 1990). Obviously, both of the interactants in the aforementioned example realized that the interaction was indeed playful. However, in a different interaction, one child said to his conversational partners, "Have you seen my green pig." One of the boys responded by saying, "There's no such thing as green pigs."

Interaction #10 Tape 1 Side A: 1640

1. A: Have you seen my green pig.

2. J: There's no such thing as %green %pigs.

3. A: It %is a green pig.

4. C: Can I %GO now.

5. J: %NO.

6. C: Well I'll tell ya

I I

7. J: >%COOLIT<. The tape recorder's by us.

8. A: It's sposta be by us. We're bildin.

The respondent evidently was unaware of the fact that the interaction was intended to be playful, and, so, he marks the violation of the conversational rule with his assessment in turn two.

Play with Fantasy and Nonsense. Fantasy play occurs when two or more children adopt roles and act out a make-believe situation or story (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987, p. 1). It involves "becoming" all types of creatures (both people and animals) and the creation of social worlds "through [the child's] manipulation and animation of various objects and materials" (Musolf, 1996, p. 307).

When children engage in fantasy play, they act out numerous roles. Children psychologically place themselves in other people's places and experience the world from their points of view. The children in my sample became something/someone other than self: They were cars, other people, other children, mommies, police officers, super-heroes, dinosaurs, alligators, dragons, lions, chickens, horses, and pigs.

Objects. In interaction one, a group of children was playing with Leggo cars. At times, the children obviously became thoroughly submerged in their roles, communicating as if they *were* the cars rather than simply powering the cars. This submersion into the car role is marked in the children's talk with the use of the subjective self's "I" and *may* serve in their construction of that subjective self. See, in particular, turns twenty-one, twenty-five, twenty-eight, and forty.

Interaction #1 Tape 1, Side A: 101

1. A: <On your mark get set go:::> ((Psshh::). When I hold this up that means go okay. (.) Alright. Justa minute.

2. E: What's that?

3. Co: Look what I got from this pit. I got ( ) and a new muffler (.) A new blue muffler I got all new muffler and ( ) good.
4. ALL: Vroo::m
5. A: Okay go. ( ) pits.
I I
6. E/Co: vroo::m
7. E: O::h it broke off (her capsher).
8. A: Here we go.
9. E: It broke off her (capsher). Didju see that (.) You can't ketch her.
I I I I I I
10. Co: vroo::m vroo::m But when =we're vroo::m.
11. A: I blew yours up.
12. E: I caught yours.
13. A: Cody-Cody blew mine up.
14. Co: That's because yours was bigger than mine.
15. E: Go ((shout))
16. A: Oh I broke off ( ).
17. E: The (capsher).
18. A: ( ).
19. Co: Go vroom ((Ughh::))
20. A: I caught you.
21. E: So.
22. A: (stop me. This).
23. E: Go ((Pshh::)).
24. A: Oh you turned me over.
25. E: That's fun. Go:::

26. A: %Whoa:: M(h)i(h)ne bu(h)st(h)ed.

27. E: Yeah you busted.

28. A: Man Ethan I busted that (capsher) right off.

29. E: You busted the (capsher).

30. A: No I busted it.

31. E: You busted it.

32. A: Ready se:t go. ((Psshh::)).

33. E: What is wrong with that.

34. A: Oh:: I smashed it.

35. A/E: Vroo::m ((Psshh::)).

36. A: I ( ). Are you

37. E: Vroo::m. Go.

38. A: Ohh::. It blew up this ((laughs)).

39. E: I am so trashed.

40. A: So's mine.

Animals. On the playground, one girl makes the statement, "**I'm** the allagator" in interaction three, turn three. Similarly, a boy makes the sound effect "%Rarr::" on the playground in interaction five, turn one. In turn two, the girl he was playing with turned to me stating matter-of-factly, "**He's** a dragon."

1. A: %RARR:: Ooh Ooh ooh ooh ooh ooh ooh ooh ooh uh

I I I I

2. B: He's a dragon Oh my gosh he's ( ).

Another girl assumed the role of a dinosaur in interaction twenty-eight:

1. M: Now I can eat them all. I'm chewin the cars now. ((Pause)). No more people to eat.

2. B: Aa::hh

3. M: Dinner's over guys.

People. In interaction thirteen, one boy says to his conversational partner, "Help. Help. **I** broke my head **mommy**."

1. A: Help. Help. I broke my head mommy.
2. Br: Why did you need that. What are you doing.
3. A: Look I broke my head open mommy. Help. Oh:: I did.

A girl in my sample assumed the role of a super-hero in interaction fifteen, stating, "**I** can fly" in turn five, and "**I** can blow fire" in turn seven.

1. J: Put-bettah put some guns on it.
2. B: Yeah ( ).

I I

3. L: I'm gonna make (.) No. I don't need guns. I'm not gonna have any guns.
4. B: (Wanna bullet down).
5. L: But I can fly.
6. B: Nuh uh.
7. L: Not this liddle guy. I can blow fire on this liddle goon-so liddle (.) He can't even blow me up (.) coz I can't-He has to kill me eight thousand times before I'm (dead).

In interaction twenty-seven, turn one, a boy says to his fellow interactants, "**Ya** bettah move it or **I'll** blow **ya** to pss::hh pss::hh pss::hh **I'll** blow **ya** to pieces. **I'm** the **police** here."

1. Da: Ya bettah move it or I'll blow ya to pss::hh pss::h pss::hh I'll blow ya to pieces. I'm the police here.
2. ALL: (Explosions/machine guns for the next several turns).

Garvey (1990) reports that children create meaningless common nouns that are odd for entertainment. One group of children in my sample was entertained by a game of absurd name calling. One child says to another, "Ya better (.) get outta my way ya (.) big

teeth." The next two times the same child has the conversational floor he calls his partner a "dinosaur" and "a big dinosaur teeth." Both interactants laugh in the following two turns.

Interaction #11 Tape 4 Side A: 23

1 De: Ya better (.) get outta my way ya (.) big (.) teeth.
I I

2. B: I can't hear.

3. C: Get outta %my way.
I I

4. D: (Hey Alex).

5. De: Ya dinasore.
I I

6 C: Get out.
I I

7. D: (Hey Alex).

8 De: Get outta my way ( ). Get outta my way ((kapoof sound effect)).
%You getta outta my way. You're a big dinasore teeth.

9. C: No I ain't. ((laughs)).

10. De: Yes you are ((laughs)).

11. C: No I ain't.

12. De: Yes yes yes yes yes ((banging)).

13. C: I am no::t a big (foot) boy.
I I

14. B: Hey (Did you know) we had the flexible ball.

15. De: Then what about this zapper. ((Psshh:: Yahh:::)).

All social play is governed by rules. Children must be able to understand the rules of play. Rules are very complex in fantasy play, and they typically are not set in advance.

Once a child adopts a role, he or she must be consistent within that role or risk sanction by his/her interactional partners. The rules are established by the players during the course of the play. This conscious manipulation of the rules provides children with the opportunity to examine the nature of rules and rule making (Johnson, Christie, & Yawkey, 1987). Therefore, play is a context in which children learn about certain rules such as turn-taking as well as the meaning of rules in general. The alligator segment nicely illustrates this point. In order to escape the terrifying alligator, the other little girls climb up the jungle gym. When the alligator follows her victims up the jungle gym, one little girl protests saying, "Allergators cant climb" (see Appendix B, interaction three).

Self-Orientation

Turn-Taking. As determined in chapter two, adult conversation is characterized by turn-taking which is organized by a set of rules with ordered options that function on a turn-by-turn basis. One participant A, talks, stops; another B starts, talks, stops; and so obtain A-B-A-B-A-B distribution of talk across participants (Levinson, 1983, p. 296).

Also, in chapter two, it was determined that children attempt to accommodate others' views, but they are constrained by their own egocentrism (Haslett, 1983). According to Dore (1985, p. 50), young children seem to negotiate turns well among peers, but, as the work on egocentrism corroborates, they do not fully integrate their ongoing topics and activities.

The aforementioned arguments on children and egocentrism were evident in my sample. According to Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (1978), less than five percent of the speech stream in adult conversation is delivered in overlap (two speakers speaking simultaneously), yet gaps between one person speaking and another starting are often measurable in a few microseconds. The best record I had of the children's talk was the tapes I was recording. Many segments of these children's talk could not be recovered because more than one child was talking at once. While adults typically deliver less than five percent of their speech stream in overlap, the children in my sample delivered about

thirty percent of their fifteen hours of talk in overlap. This indicates that children do not always follow adult conversational rules during play-time activities.

Relevance. It was not uncommon for the children in my sample to be focused on their own individual activities rather than the activities of the others with whom they were playing. This was evident in the lack of relevance to the previous speaker's utterance. The children commonly interrupted their conversational partners, and these interruptions were usually a change in topic, indicating significant deviance from adult conversation where attention to local organizational structures is routinely paid. The children were often more interested in following their *own* lines of activity. For example, in interaction eleven, turns fourteen and fifteen, "B" interrupts "C" with Hey (did you know) we had the flexible ball. "D's" utterance in the next turn displays his lack of orientation to the conversation when he fails to provide a SPP answer to the FPP question saying, "Then what about this zapper. Psshh:: Yahh:::"

Interaction #11 Tape 4 Side A: 23

1 De: Ya better (.) get outta my way ya (.) big (.) teeth.
I I

2. B: I can't hear.

3. C: Get outta %my way.
I I

4. D: (Hey Alex).

5. De: Ya dinasore.
I I

6 C: Get out.
I I

7. D: (Hey Alex).

8 De: Get outta my way ( ). Get outta my way ((kapoof sound effect)).
%You getta outta my way. You're a big dinasore teeth.

9. C: No I ain't. ((laughs)).

10. De: Yes you are ((laughs)).

11. C: No I ain't.

12. De: Yes yes yes yes yes ((banging)).

13. C: I am no::t a big (foot) boy.

I I

14. B: Hey (Did you know) we had the flexible ball.

15. De: Then what about this zapper. ((Psshh:: Yahh:::)).

Yet another example of the same phenomena is provided in interaction twenty. "Da" is shooting at his teammate, "A" because he is trying to steal his parking space. During their interaction, "D" interrupts "C," belting out the song "Secret A:::gent."

Interaction #20, Tape #14 Side A: 116, *Army*

1. A: No. I'm on YOUR team.

2. Da: No I'm shootin' atcha becuz you were tryin to steal my parkin space.

3. A: NO.

4. C: ((laughs)).

I I

5. Da: I'm gonna shootcha coz you stole my parkin place.

6. C: He can't ( ) I wouldn't think you would wanna do that with so many people.

I I

7. De: Secret A:::gent.

8. Da: I shotcha down. I shotcha down.

Adjacency Pairs. In chapter two, it was recognized that adjacency pairs are a local organizational structure in conversation (Levinson, 1983). They are a sequence of two utterances produced by different speakers ordered as a first pair part (FPP) and a second pair part (SPP). The FPP constitutes some action the speaker is performing, and the SPP

is a response to that action. Levinson (1983) maintains that adjacency pairs are the type of paired utterances of which question-answer, summons-response, offer-acceptance, greeting-greeting, etc. are protypical.

The use of adjacency pairs signifies that conversationalists are actively involved in the joint demands of the interaction. They *require* two different speakers oriented to *one another's* talk. It was not uncommon for the children to fail to issue an appropriate SPP response to another child's FPP. For example, in interaction one, turn two, "A" asks the FPP question, "When I hold this up that means go okay?" He pauses, and, when his fellow interactants fail to respond, he answers his own question with "Alright." In the same interaction, FPP questions were asked in turns nine and thirty-four. No SPP answer was provided.

Interaction #1 Tape 1, Side A: 101

1. A: <On your mark get set go:::> ((Psshh::). When I hold this up that means go okay. (.) Alright. Justa minute.
2. E: What's that?
3. Co: Look what I got from this pit. I got ( ) and a new muffler (.) A new blue muffler I got all new muffler and ( ) good.
4. ALL: Vroo::m
5. A: Okay go. ( ) pits.

   I I
6. E/Co: vroo::m
7. E: O::h it broke off (her capsher).
8. A: Here we go.
9. E: It broke off her (capsher). Didju see that (.) You can't ketch her.

   I I I I I I
10. Co: vroo::m vroo::m But when =we're vroo::m.

11. A: I blew yours up.
12. E: I caught yours.
13. A: Cody-Cody blew mine up.
14. Co: That's because yours was bigger than mine.
15. E: Go ((shout))
16. A: Oh I broke off ( ).
17. E: The (capsher).
18. A: ( ).
19. Co: Go vroom ((Ughh::))
20. A: I caught you.
21. E: So.
22. A: (stop me. This).
23. E: Go ((Pshh::)).
24. A: Oh you turned me over.
25. E: That's fun. Go:::
26. A: %Whoa:: M(h)i(h)ne bu(h)st(h)ed.
27. E: Yeah you busted.
28. A: Man Ethan I busted that (capsher) right off.
29. E: You busted the (capsher).
30. A: No I busted it.
31. E: You busted it.
32. A: Ready se:t go. ((Psshh::)).
33. E: What is wrong with that.
34. A: Oh:: I smashed it.
35. A/E: Vroo::m ((Psshh::)).
36. A: I ( ). Are you
37. E: Vroo::m. Go.

38. A: Ohh::. It blew up this ((laughs)).

39. E: I am so trashed.

40. A: So's mine.

Yet another example of a FPP question that does not receive a SPP answer occurs in interaction number six, turn one. A group of children are putting a puzzle together. "A" asks, "Where's the dinky dinky piece?" "A's" conversational partners "poke fun" at his question by generating various words rhyming with "dinky" in turns three through six, eight, and ten through fourteen. In turn fifteen, "A" reprimands one of his fellow interactants.

Interaction #6 Tape 1 Side A: 1305

1. A: Where's the dinky dinky piece.

2. M: (Sam (.) Don't even think about playin ((laugh))).

3. C: Dinky. Pinky. ((laugh)).

4. J: Clinky.

5. E: Dinky.

6. J: Winky.

7. M: That goes at the bottom.

8. J: Dinky.

9. M: Hey wait a minute.

10. E: %Drinky. %Pinky.

11. J: Tink. Rinky.

12. E: Nikki.

13. J: Rinky. Clinky.

14. C: Crinky. Rinky.

I I

15. A: Ju:stin be qui:et.

16. M: You guys we gotta figure this out.

Instrumental Goals. According to Clark and Delia (1979), instrumental goals are focused on the overt purpose of the utterance. Because the children frequently failed to create SPP answers to FPP questions, for example, they were failing to fulfill the pragmatic, instrumental goals of conversation.

Orientation to Others

While the children were frequently focused on their own lines of action, they occasionally focused on the actions of others as well. This is not at all surprising considering the line of research concerning the age in which the child is able to take the attitude of others.

Turn-Taking. There were a few interactions in which there were no interruptions at all. One example of this phenomena was discovered in the "Name Game."

Interaction #2 Tape 1, Side A: 198

1. R: I'm Ethun.
2. J: I'm (Jaquelyn).
3. R: I'm E-thun.
4. J: I'm (Jaquelyn).
5. R: Hi Ry-yun. Hi Ryun. Ethun. Hi Ryun. Ethun. Ethun. I'm Ethun and you're Ryun.

Relevance. Occasionally, the previous speaker's utterance was relevant to sequential speakers' utterances, and the children succeeded in adherence to the topic at hand. Thus, the conversation was organized as most adult conversations are. A primary example of this phenomena occurred in one group of children's selection of play activity.

Interaction #14 Tape 4 Side A: 131

1. A: No let's have war.
2. B: No no not war.
3. C: Yeah yeah

4. D: Yeah %wa::r

I I

5. E: IThis is my secret hideout.

6. A: Hey. You against me. I'm the bad one.

I I

7. D: %wa::r

8. C: Huh-uh. I'm the-I'm the

I I

9. D: I'm the-I'm the good guy. I'm the good guy.

10. A: No. No. You two are the good ones and I'm the bad one becoz mine's really big and stuff (.) and it can (.) come out and ( ).

11. D: I'm makin well I'm tryin to make what I did the last time.

12. E: There's not a horse in my hideout!

13. ALL: ((laughing)).

Adjacency Pairs. The appropriate use of adjacency pairs demonstrates that interactionists are actively involved in the joint demands of conversation. They *require* two different speakers oriented to *one another's* talk. At times, the children issued an appropriate SPP response to another child's FPP.

The children were oriented to the conversation when their interactional partners issued a FPP summons for the majority of the time. The transcript indicates that a SPP answer was provided to a FPP summons eight out of nine times. The summons-answer adjacency pair has a high degree of conditional relevance. Children *may use* the summons more frequently than adults because it is useful since other FPPs frequently fail to elicit a SPP answer.

Interaction #3 Tape 1 Side A: 142

1. A: Magun.

2. B: What.

Interaction #21, Tape #13 Side B: 354

1. N: Camrun.
2. C: Wow.

Interaction #25, Tape #10 Side A: 340

1. S: >Brooke, I found a live person. I found a (.) live person.<
2. B: A LIVE PERSON? SHOOT EM!

Interaction #26, Tape #10 Side B: 221

1. A: DANNY, you can't do that. You gotta be dead sometimes.
2. D: I'm already not dead. You're already dead.

Sometimes the children provided responses to other FPP's as well.

Interaction #4 Tape 1 Side A: 1012

4. D: Are you a liyun.
5. B: Yeah I'm playin the liyun king.

Interaction #10 Tape 1 Side A: 1640

1. A: Have you seen my green pig.
2. J: There's no such thing as %green %pigs.

Instrumental Goals. When the children followed turn-taking rules and issued SPP's to FPP's, they were fulfilling the pragmatic, instrumental goals of conversation. They were observing adult conversational rules.

Fantasy Play. As previously mentioned, one way in which children solicit the attention and orientation of their playmates is through the summons-answer adjacency pair. I found that children also solicited the attention and orientation of their playmates when they engaged in fantasy play, taking the role of another person, animal, or object (see *Play with Fantasy and Nonsense* pp. 32-35). This acting out of possible selves, as well as the use of the summons-answer adjacency pair, reflect the child's increasing use of adaptive communicative strategies, which are used to solicit the attention and orientation of others.

Appendix A

Wednesday, April 2, 1997

I understand that a graduate student in Speech Communication at Eastern Illinois University is conducting research on ordinary conversation. I hereby grant him/her permission to tape record, transcribe, and analyze my child's conversation at recess for the purposes of research on children's play. I understand that my child's anonymity will be preserved in the presentation of findings.

I would/would not appreciate receiving a report of his/her findings if my child is used as a research subject.

_____

Signature of Parent of Minor Date

_____

Address if Report Requested

Appendix B

Interaction #1 Tape 1, Side A: 101: *Playing with Leggo Cars*

1. A: <On your mark get set go:::> ((Psshh::). When I hold this up that means go okay. (.) Alright. Justa minute.
2. E: What's that?
3. Co: Look what I got from this pit. I got ( ) and a new muffler (.) A new blue muffler I got all new muffler and ( ) good.
4. ALL: Vroo::m
5. A: Okay go. ( ) pits.
   I I
6. E/Co: vroo::m
7. E: O::h it broke off (her capsher).
8. A: Here we go.
9. E: It broke off her (capsher). Didju see that (.) You can't ketch her.
   I I I I I I
10. Co: vroo::m vroo::m But when =we're vroo::m.
11. A: I blew yours up.
12. E: I caught yours.
13. A: Cody-Cody blew mine up.
14. Co: That's because yours was bigger than mine.
15. E: Go ((shout))
16. A: Oh I broke off ( ).
17. E: The (capsher).
18. A: ( ).
19. Co: Go vroom ((Ughh::))
20. A: I caught you.

21. E: So.
22. A: (stop me. This).
23. E: Go ((Pshh::)).
24. A: Oh you turned me over.
25. E: That's fun. Go:::
26. A: %Whoa:: M(h)i(h)ne bu(h)st(h)ed.
27. E: Yeah you busted.
28. A: Man Ethan I busted that (capsher) right off.
29. E: You busted the (capsher).
30. A: No I busted it.
31. E: You busted it.
32. A: Ready se:t go. ((Psshh::)).
33. E: What is wrong with that.
34. A: Oh:: I smashed it.
35. A/E: Vroo::m ((Psshh::)).
36. A: I ( ). Are you
37. E: Vroo::m. Go.
38. A: Ohh::. It blew up this ((laughs)).
39. E: I am so trashed.
40. A: So's mine.

Interaction #2 Tape 1, Side A: 198, *Name Game*

1. R: I'm Ethun.
2. J: I'm (Jaquelyn).
3. R: I'm E-thun.
4. J: I'm (Jaquelyn).
5. R: Hi Ry-yun. Hi Ryun. Ethun. Hi Ryun. Ethun. Ethun. I'm Ethun and you're Ryun.

Interaction #3 Tape 1 Side A: 142, *Alligator*

1. A: Magun.
2. B: What.
3. A: I'm the allagator.
4. M: You're hopeless. You can neva get me no::w.
5. C. Look at me. Look at me.
6. M: Allagator. Ketch me ((Scream)).
7. D: Allergator allergator can't ketch me. Who's the one that's up in the tree ((scream)). Allergators can't clime.
8. A: (An allagator coz I feel like climin). Rah:: Rah::
9. M/D: ((Scream)).
10. B: Allergator allergator allergator.
11. A: %RAH:: %RAH:: %RAH::
12. M/D: ((Scream)).

Interaction #4 Tape 1 Side A: 1012, *Lion King*

1. A: %ROAR::
2. BC: ((scream))
3. B: Save me::
4. D: Are you a liyun.
5. B: Yeah I'm playin the liyun king.
6. A: %Roar:::
7. B: Can't get me. Can't get me.
8. A: %Roar::
9. BC: ((scream))

Interaction #5 Tape 1 Side A: 118, *Dragon*

1. A: %RARR:: Ooh Ooh ooh ooh ooh ooh ooh ooh ooh uh

I I

2. B: He's a dragon Oh my gosh he's ( ).

Interaction #6 Tape 1 Side A: 1305, *Whale Puzzle*

1. A: Where's the dinky dinky piece.
2. M: (Sam (.) Don't even think about playin ((laugh))).
3. C: Dinky. Pinky. ((laugh)).
4. J: Clinky.
5. E: Dinky.
6. J: Winky.
7. M: That goes at the bottom.
8. J: Dinky.
9. M: Hey wait a minute.
10. E: %Drinky. %Pinky.
11. J: Tink. Rinky.
12. E: Nikki.
13. J: Rinky. Clinky.
14. C: Crinky. Rinky.

I I

15. A: Ju:stin be qui:et.
16. M: You guys we gotta figure this out.

Interaction #7 Tape 1 Side A: 1425, *Language as an Instrument of Play*

1. S: Chicka chicka bang bang.
2. J: Chicka chicka bang bang.
3. J: Chicka chicka bang bang.
4. J: Chicka chicka bang bang.

Interaction #8 Tape 1 Side A: 1564, *Making a Farm*

1. D: He::y. I'm usin it for my chicken barn.

I I

2. B: (Here use this) Here look. Here look.

3. C: Chicken barn. Bock bo::ck. B-b-b-bo::ck.

4. B: Here ya go. Here ya go Devon.

Interaction #9 Tape 1 Side A: 1623, *Making a Farm*

1. J: Don't nock down this fence.

2. B: I dint.

3. J: This was very hard to bild.

4. ( ).

5. C: Whee:: hee:: hee::. Look at the horse. Horse wocking ((knocks)). Whee:: hee:: hee::.

6. D: Look here. Here's a pig. Oinkoinkoinkoinkoinkoinkoink.

Interaction #10 Tape 1 Side A: 1640, *Green Pig*

1. A: Have you seen my green pig.

2. J: There's no such thing as %green %pigs.

3. A: It %is a green pig.

4. C: Can I %GO now.

5. J: %NO.

6. C: Well I'll tell ya

I I

7. J: >%COOLIT<. The tape recorder's by us.

8. A: It's sposta be by us. We're bildin.

Interaction #11 Tape 4 Side A: 23, *Building a Farm*

1 De: Ya better (.) get outta my way ya (.) big (.) teeth.

I I

2. B: I can't hear.

3. C: Get outta %my way.

I I

4. D: (Hey Alex).

5. De: Ya dinasore.

I I

6 C: Get out.

I I

7. D: (Hey Alex).

8 De: Get outta my way ( ). Get outta my way ((kapoof sound effect)).

%You getta outta my way. You're a big dinasore teeth.

9. C: No I ain't. ((laughs)).

10. De: Yes you are ((laughs)).

11. C: No I ain't.

12. De: Yes yes yes yes yes ((banging)).

13. C: I am no::t a big (foot) boy.

I I

14. B: Hey (Did you know) we had the flexible ball.

15. De: Then what about this zapper. ((Psshh:: Yahh:::)).

Interaction #12 Tape 4 Side A: 69, *Building a Farm*

1. L: This is a horsepiddle.

2. B: A horsepiddle?

3. L: Yeah. This is a horsepiddle.

4. B: Where do you put the horses (dingy).

I I

5. L: I said the horsepiddle. ((both laugh)).

Interaction #13 Tape 4 Side A: 100, *Building a Farm*

1. A: Help. Help. I broke my head mommy.

2. Br: Why did you need that. What are you doing.

3. A: Look I broke me head open mommy. Help. Oh:: I did.

Interaction #14 Tape 4 Side A: 131, *War*

1. A: No let's have war.

2. B: No no not war.

3. C: Yeah yeah

4. D: Yeah %wa::r

I I

5. E: This is my secret hideout.

6. A: Hey. You against me. I'm the bad one.

I I

7. D: %wa::r

8. C: Huh-uh. I'm the-I'm the

I I

9. D: I'm the-I'm the good guy. I'm the good guy.

10. A: No. No. You two are the good ones and I'm the bad one becoz mine's really big and stuff (.) and it can (.) come out and ( ).

11. D: I'm makin well I'm tryin to make what I did the last time.

12. E: There's not a horse in my hideout!

13. ALL: ((laughing)).

Interaction #15 Tape 4 Side A: 144, *War*

1. J: Put-bettah put some guns on it.

2. B: Yeah ( ).

I I

3. L: I'm gonna make (.) No. I don't need guns. I'm not gonna have any guns.

4. B: (Wanna bullet down).

5. L: But I can fly.

6. B: Nuh uh.

7. L: Not this liddle guy. I can blow fire on this liddle goon-so liddle (.) He can't even blow me up (.) coz I can't-He has to kill me eight thousand times before I'm (dead).

Interaction #16, Tape #14 Side A: 001, *Army*

1. Da: *Car:l* CARL COME IN.

2. J: My namz not Carl (.) My namz Jon.

3. Da: Now I got ( ).

I I

4. De: You know what my name is?

5. Da: My name - my namz - HIS namz uh ( ).

I I

6. De: My namz - my namz Car - My namz ( ).

I I

7. Da: My namz - My namz Danny his namz Ryan.

8. De: Well MY name IS (.) Stan.

9. J: Stan ( )?

10. De: Yeah.

Interaction #17, Tape #14 Side A: 017, *Army*

1. Da: I'm shootin down the cop.

I I

2. B: Aa::h Pss:hh:.

3. Da: I'm shootin down the cop.

I I

4. C: I only got THREE of these.

5. De: Why?

6. Da: Boom boom boom boom boom boom.

7. De: Why?

8. Da: Coz he's tryin to arrest my frind. Boom boom boom boom boom boom.

Interaction #18, Tape #14 Side A: 029, *Army*

1. Da: I'm drivin. A-Act like I'm drivin in my jeep.

2. B: Ppppp: Psshh::

I I

3. Da: But he won't rilly git in it.

4. B: Yeah (.) Let's go.

I I

5. De: Yeah but

I I

6. B: boom boom boom boom boom boom

7. De: Yeah. Pretind we're comin back home.

8. Da: HEY. You knocked my guy off.

9. B: Boom boom boom boom.

10. De: Pretind we're protecting the place by (.) puttin things everywhere (.) like here.

11. Da: Pss:hh: I can man the door. Pss::hh:

12. J: Sumbuddy can have this one.

13. Da: (truck did)

14. De: Huh?

15. Da: >No look-look guys look guys< This could be my ( )

I I

16. B: Look I came in here.

came out've this door. Hey watch. Hey (.) Jared Jared

17. De: And I jumped (.) thru ALL'VE these.

18. B: Bss:hh bss:hh yea:h bss:hh I broke thru all the ( )

I I

19. De: <u>THIS GUY'S SHOT</u> pppp::

<u>LET'S GO</u>!

<u>Interaction #19, Tape #14 Side A: 066, *Army*</u>

1. Da: Pretind you fell an there's a body layin on the mountin.

I I

2 B: Jared.

3. Da: I found a body. Repeat. I found a body. Repeat. I found <u>ANOTHER</u>

body. Repeat. I found <u>ANOTHER</u> body. Repeat.

I I

4. De: But then I got out of the hospital two

weeks later.

5. Da: The other b-but then we were all best frinds.

6. B: Earr:: boom boom boom boom. Vroo::m.

I I

7. De: Yeah. But-but-but some tanks been

comin in.

8. Da: Yeah.

9. De: Comin in. (now now) No that's your tank. That's your tank.

I I

10. Da: Hey we're gonna Yeah and it-and it came in two weeks later.

11. De: We yeah. We:: an you called. You guys called for extra force.

I I

12. B: Hey wherdja git that truck? Wherdja git that truck?

13. De: EXTRA FORCE.

14. D: Uhm I used it from you

15. De: But-but this was ( ) and this was ( ).

16. J: Can I play with it coz I have the wagon to it.

17. B: Vroo:m vroo:m.

18. De: An people ( ) an I was pushing this.

I I

19. B: ( )You can have ( ).

I I

20. Da: No you Jared. <u>You</u> called for extra force an you said, "RYAN, RYAN WE NEED EXTRA FORCE."

21. De: Ryan, Ryan we need extra force.

22. Da: An-an I pushed this an ( )

I I

23. De: IThat's my-that's my extra force <u>WE</u> need extra force.

24. Da: I gotta go an you said over there.

25. De: OVER THERE.

26. Da: Man. <u>WE GOT SOME EXTRA FORCES</u>!

<u>Interaction #20, Tape #14 Side A: 116,</u> ***<u>Army</u>***

1. A: No. I'm on YOUR team.
2. Da: No I'm shootin' atcha becuz you were tryin to steal my parkin space.
3. A: NO.
4. C: ((laughs)).

I I

5. Da: I'm gonna shootcha coz you stole my parkin place.
6. C: He can't ( ) I wouldn't think you would wanna do that with so many people.

I I

7. De: Secret A:::gent.
8. Da: I shotcha down. I shotcha down.

Interaction #21, Tape #13 Side B: 354, *Army & Dinosaurs*

1. N: Camrun.
2. C: Wow.
3. N: I'm gonna getcha bs:hh bs:hh. I'm goin down. May day may day.
4. C: ((laughs))
5. Co: Taradactle.
6. ABCD: ((explosions)).
7. Co: I'm a taradactle. I'm a (burning) taradactle.
8. N: Hey hey. This is what I'm sposta do you know like in the Air Force when a jeep goes up to-into a show stand ( ) airplanes down.

I I

9. M: Pss:hh.
10. C: I don't get it.
11. N: May day may day I'm goin down. (bss::hh)

Interaction #22, Tape #13 Side B: 399, *Army & Dinosaurs*

1. C: Ah man look at this.

2. N: You're bigger than me but I'm better.
3. C: Look. Can you swim with this.
4. Co/M: ((Explosions))
5. N: Wait a minit. You're bigger than me but I'M better.
6. Co/M: ((Explosions))
7. Co: >Mommy told me never to git in the dark before.<
8. M: ((Explosion))
9. C: Don't blow your ((explosion))
10. C/N: ( ).
11. M: ((Explosions))

Interaction #23, Tape #13 Side B: 424, *Army & Dinosaurs*

1. C: Look. Yummy. Yummy. I luv raptors. I luv raptors. I-I love taranasorus rex.
2. N: He's comin in. He's comin in. AA::hh aa::hh a:h.
I I
3. Co: I luv you.
4. M: Look Nathan. Nathan.
5. C: I luv raptors. Iee: Iee:. He thot this was a raptor. Oh I luv raptors too. ((crunch)) No I luv you aa:h ((crunch)).

Interaction #24, Tape #10 Side A: 258, *Army*

1. L: >HEY MACKE. GET OVER HERE. THERE'S DEAD PEOPLE OVER HERE.<
2. S: ( ).
3. L: (referring to the army men) >WE'RE KILLIN THEM. WE'RE KILLIN THEM.<
4. B: *Look. ((pause)) Look.*
5. L: *Psshh*

6. A: >OT OH. TIME TO GO BACK OVER<

7. S: ( ).

I I

8. L: What is it.

9. A: TIME TO GO HOME.

10. B: Macke, get them. Macke, get all the dead people.

11. M: Okay, ( ) Brooke.

12. B: Vroom

13. A: >Let's go get the dead people.<

Interaction #25, Tape #10 Side A: 340, *Army*

1. S: >Brooke, I found a live person. I found a (.) live person.<

2. B: A LIVE PERSON? SHOOT EM!

3. M: NO DON'T! DON'T SHOOT EM! We can take em back to the dunjun=

I I

4. WHY?

5. M: =when they die.

6. ALL: ((laugh)).

7. L: YEAH! AND WE CAN CHOKE EM! WE CAN CHOKE EM.

Interaction #26, Tape #10 Side B: 221, *Army*

1. A: DANNY, you can't do that. You gotta be dead sometimes.

2. D: I'm already not dead. You're already dead.

3. C: *Pss::hh Pss:hh Pss:hh Pss:hh Pss:hh Pss:hh Pss:hh Pss:hh*

I I

4. A: I know. ( )

5. C: You're blew up.

Interaction #27, Tape #10 Side B: 291, *Army*

1. Da: Ya bettah move it or I'll blow ya to pss::hh pss::h pss::hh I'll blow ya to pieces. I'm the police here.
2. ALL: (Exlosions/machine guns for the next several turns).

Interaction #28, Tape #11 Side B: 88, *Army & Dinosaurs*

1. M: Now I can eat them all. I'm chewin the cars now. ((Pause)). No more people to eat.
2. B: Aa::hh
3. M: Dinner's over guys.

Interaction #29, Tape #11 Side B: 104, *Army & Dinosaurs*

1. M: I got the captin right here, girls. Well, I'm gonna shoot em in the butt.
2. B: Yo:w!
3. ALL: ((laugh))

Interaction #30, Tape #11 Side B: 191, *Army & Dinosaurs*

1. Ja: I-I shot em with an arrow. I put-I put em on top of a uh uhm uhm (can), and I shot em. My arrow.

Interaction #31, Tape #11 Side B: 209, *Army & Dinosaurs*

1. Da: James, look.
2. Ja: No. Don't eat my men.
3. Da: CHARGE! ((bugle sounds))

Appendix C

Transcript Notation System

1. Turns at talk are numbered and identified by reference to the speaker's first name initial. If the speaker's voice is unrecognizable to the transcriptionist, the speakers are identified by the sequence in which they speak (i.e., the first participant to talk in a segment is "A." The second speaker to talk in a segment is "B."
2. I - Links simultaneous utterances (overlaps) at the start and end of the overlap (except in the case of laughter where only the start of the overlap is marked).
3. (=) - Marks a) contiguous utterances (where there is no interval between turns) and b) the different parts of one speaker's continuous flow of speech which has been carried over to the next line following an interruption by the other speaker.
4. ((pause)) - Marks intervals in the talk within or between turns. A very small interval is marked with (.). A hyphen - marks a short, abrupt stop at the end of a word.
5. : - marks sound extension.
6. ? - indicates a rising inflection.
7. ! - indicates an animated tone.
8. % - marks altered pitch (higher or lower) of the syllable of the word following it.
9. Underline - indicates stress.
10. CAPITALS - mark the talk as louder than the surrounding talk.
11. * * - asterisks enclose talk which is lower in volume than the surrounding talk.
12. (( ))- mark various speech sounds where they occur, i.e. ((cough)) ((laughs)) ((groan)) ((snort)), or other details of the conversational scene ((explosion sounds)) ((whispered))
13. > < - enclose speech which is spoken at a faster rate than surrounding speech.
14. ( ) - marks transcriptionist doubt about the utterance and may be empty if the talk is completely unrecoverable or filled with what was apparently said.

References

Blumer, H. (1969). Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Capella, J. N. (1990). The method of proof by example in interaction analysis. Communication Monographs, 57, 236-242.

Clark, R. A., & Delia, J. G. (1979). Topoi and rhetorical competence. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 65, 187-206.

Corsaro, W. A. (1985). Friendship and peer culture in the early years. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Denzin, N. K. (1979). Toward a social psychology of childhood socialization. Contemporary Sociology, 55, 550-556.

Denzin, N. K. (1972). The genesis of self in early childhood. The Sociological Quarterly, 13, 291-314.

Dore, J. (1985). Children's conversations. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), Handbook of Discourse Analysis. New York, NY: Academic Press (pp. 47-63).

Fein, G. G. (1985). Learning in play: Surfaces of thinking and feeling. In J. L. Frost & S. Sunderlin (Eds.), When children play (pp. 45-53). Maryland: Association for Childhood Education International.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). Studies in ethnomethodology. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Garvey, C. (1977). Play with language and speech. In S. E. Tripp & C. M. Kernan (Eds.), Child discourse (pp. 27-47). New York: Academic Press.

Garvey, C. (1990). Play (2nd ed.). Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Garza, M., Briley, S., & Reifel, S. Children's views of play. In J. L. Frost & S. Sunderlin (Eds.), When children play (pp. 31-37). Maryland: Association for Childhood Education International.

Goodwin, M. H. (1990). He-said-she-said. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Haslett, B. J. (1983). Communicative functions and strategies in children's conversations. Human Communication Research, 9, 114-129.

Isenberg, J., & Evelyn, J. (1985). Playful literacy activities and learning: Preliminary observations. In J. L. Frost & S. Sunderlin (Eds.), When children play (pp. 17-21). Maryland: Association for Childhood Education International.

Jacobs, S. (1990). On the especially nice fit between qualitative analysis and the known properties of conversation. Communication Monographs, 57, 243-249.

Jefferson, G. (1984). Transcript notation. In J. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Eds.), Structures of social action (pp. 9-16). Cambridge, U. K.: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, J. E., Christie, J. F., & Yawkey, T. D. (1987). Play and early childhood development. Illinois: Scott Foresman and Company.

Kinch, J. W. (1967). A formalized theory of self-concept. In J. Manis & B. Meltzer (Eds.), Symbolic interaction: A reader in social psychology (pp. 232-240). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Kuczaj, S. A. (1986). Language play. In S. Burroughs & R. Evans (Eds.), Play, language, and socialization (pp. 177-191). New York: Gordon & Breach Science Publishers.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levy, A. K. (1986). The language of play: The role of play in language development. In S. Burroughs & R. Evans (Eds.), Play, language, and socialization (pp. 163-175). New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.

Mead, G. H. (1962). Mind, self, and society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Musolf, G. R. (1996). Interactionism and the child: Cahill, Corsaro, and Denzin on childhood socialization. Symbolic Interaction, 19, 303-321.

Pomerantz, A. (1990). Chautauqua: On the validity and generalizability of conversational analysis methods. Communication Monographs, 57, 231-235.

Sachs, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1978). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. In J. Schenkein (ed.), Studies in the organization of conversational interaction (pp. 7-55). New York: Academic Press.

Saracho, O. N. (1986). Young children's play behaviors and cognitive styles. In S. Burroughs & R. Evans (Eds.), Play, language, and socialization (pp. 21-38). New York: Gordon and Breach Science Publishers.

Singer, J. L. (1995). Imaginative play in childhood: Pre-cursor of subjunctive thought, daydreaming, and adult pretend games. In A. D. Pellegrini (Ed.), The future of play theory (pp. 187-219). New York: State University of New York Press.

Staske, S. A. (1996). Talking feelings: The collaborative construction of emotion in talk between close relational partners. Symbolic Interaction, 19, 111-135.

Staske, S. A. (1994). The instantiation of emotion in conversations between romantic partners, male friends, female friends, and cross-sex friends. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Trenholm, S., & Jensen, A. (1992). Interpersonal communication. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.